

The LENINIST

Ireland p3

China p4-5

Kurds and Turks p8

Unemployed Organiser

Socialism in danger

SOcialism in the socialist countries — which are “the embodiment of the victory over capitalism on an international scale” — is being corroded from within and eroded from without. We are living through a drawn out 1914 (when the parties of the Second International went over to their ‘own’ ruling classes), drawn out because our ‘1914’ involves not only parties but states.

On the periphery of the socialist world, Kampuchea is now Cambodia again. It no longer calls itself socialist. Nor does Afghanistan. Deserted by Gorbachev, it is frankly living on time borrowed because of the bungling of the Mujahedin counterrevolutionaries. The situation in the heartlands of socialism points in the same direction.

So confident have the leaders of the top imperialist countries — the G7, group of seven — become that they openly talk of the death of communism. Gorbachev’s letter to their Paris meeting pleading for “complete participation” in the “world economy” and promising great benefits from the “opening up of a market as big as the Soviet Union” has only reinforced the arrogant confidence of the imperialists (*Morning Star* July 18 1989). His message was greeted with a mixture of contempt and joy. Contempt for his grovelling. Joy because it was seen as an admission that the Soviet Union had finally surrendered and admitted it has lost the Cold War.

For the imperialists, what is crucial is a step by step managed dismantling of socialism. They do not want a sudden collapse or drift into a power vacuum. After squeezing the Soviet Army out of Afghanistan they are turning their attention to Eastern Europe — and in particular Hungary and Poland, which undoubtedly constitute today’s weak links in the socialist system. At the Paris summit the imperialists reached the stage of laying down initial plans to aid the restoration of capitalism.

Bush returned from his trip to Poland and Hungary in triumph. To Bush, developments in these countries are the first signs in realising Kennedy’s dream of a ‘free Europe’, ie a Europe free of communism. No wonder. In Hungary ‘communist’ leaders praise the 1956 counterrevolution, advocate leaving the Warsaw Pact and talk of forming a new governing social democratic party which would rule in alliance with openly pro-capitalist liberals. But Poland is just ahead of Hungary at the moment in the drive towards redefining itself as a pluralistic Central European nation as opposed to an authoritarian Eastern European nation. Such a redefinition is a geographic cover for a social redefinition.

The counterrevolutionary Solidarnosc relegalised in April went on in June to win a landslide in elections to the senate (99 out of 100 seats). But Bush did not come only to praise Solidarnosc. He also

praised the leadership of the PUWP. President (recount) Jaruzelski is Bush’s type of communist, just as Lech Walesa is his type of trade unionist. After all, they are both committed to burying the planned economy and restoring the dominance of the capitalist market.

Moves are already afoot to sell off state owned enterprises to investors at “home and abroad” and integrate Poland into the capitalist section of the world economy, through making the zloty convertible. As we said in the last edition of *The Leninist*, this would amount to a “a peaceful democratic counterrevolution”.

Peaceful, because the restoration of capitalism will not mean the smashing of the state; the Polish ‘socialist’ police and army will defend the new capitalist property relations. Democratic, because as shown by the elections the masses will not lift a finger to defend the old order.

Of course, western government leaders tell the Poles that capitalism will produce Swedish type social democracy and Swedish type living standards. Again, as we have pointed out, this is nonsense. Even the *Economist*, the most fervent advocate of Thatcherite capitalism admits that the “first effects” of restoring capitalism “will be to make things worse” (July 15, 1989). There will be austerity, mass unemployment and perhaps hyper-inflation. This is bound to provoke resistance. There is every reason therefore to think that any post-peaceful counterrevolution regime will eventually be replaced by one of blood and iron.

Not surprisingly, Solidarnosc does not want to take governmental positions at the moment. It rightly fears a “social explosion”, which it admits it could not control. Solidarnosc is made up of peasants and rip-off middle men, workers and capitalists, liberal intellectuals and priestly bigots; a highly unstable formation, liable to shatter the moment it puts a toe into the corridors of power.

That is why we don’t think capitalism will lead to democratic stability in Poland (even the sham parliamentary sort), only the danger of a return to a new form of the church-backed Pidsulskyite semi-fascist military regime which ran the country in the 1920s and 30s. Capitalism, in other words, will bring the jackboot, bans on divorce and abortion, and poverty.

Recognising that talk of a “social explosion” is not doom-mongering, many media pundits, for example Edward Mortimer in the *Financial Times*, as well as some in the leading circles in France and Federal Germany, have insisted that a new Marshall Plan is needed in order to ensure that the “dismantling” of the “command economy” and the return to “fully-fledged capitalism” proceeds without causing a complete breakdown. (*Financial Times* July 11, 1989)

A new Marshall Plan could not be centred on US capital. The US

is not the power it was in 1947. Today it has a massive deficit. It is Japan and Federal Germany which have come to rival the US and have the giant surpluses. A new Marshall Plan would, if it ever materialised, be a scramble for Eastern Europe which would heighten the maturing inter-imperialist antagonisms and increase the danger of a World War III as each power tries to gain advantage.

And, of course, a new Marshall Plan could never transform Poland, Hungary or any other Eastern European country into a Japan or a Federal Germany. These countries were and are major imperialist powers. The recipients of a new Marshall Plan would become neo-colonies, most likely of a German led European Community. That would be their fate.

What about the USSR, the world’s revolutionary centre? Is it still a bulwark for the defence of socialism? Will it rescue Poland and Hungary from the clutches of imperialist slavery? No. Addressing the Council of Europe in Strasbourg on 6 July 7 Gorbachev in effect promised the imperialists that the Soviet Union would never again intervene in Eastern Europe as it did in 1956 and 1968.

“Social and political orders in one or another country changed in the past”, he said, “and may change in the future. But this change is the exclusive affair of the people of that country and is their choice. Any interference in domestic affairs and any attempts to restrict the sovereignty of states, both friends and allies or any others, are inadmissible.” (*The Economist* July 15 1989)

Gorbachev is in effect washing his hands of Eastern Europe. He is actively encouraging accommodation with counterrevolutionary forces in Poland and Hungary (a meeting with Lech Walesa is strongly rumoured to be on the cards) in the hope of currying favour with the imperialists.

Why should this be? Bureaucratic socialism in the USSR has run out of all progressive possibilities. In an attempt to preserve its privileges the technocratic Gorbachevite wing of the bureaucracy has turned to ‘market socialism’, just as Poland and Hungary have. His perestroika, has as everyone knows, been sweetened with glasnost.

Glasnost has, though, nothing to do with a return to Leninist democratic norms, as Gorbachev claims; this would mean power passing to councils of workers, soldiers and collective farmers, as opposed to the indirectly elected Peoples Congress bourgeois style parliament, it would mean all state officials (including Gorbachev) only receiving the average worker’s pay, it would mean the plurality of parties and it would mean the running of a central economic plan through mass control and participation.

Economically, far from producing anything positive, Gorbachev’s perestroika has led to a growing paralysis. It has also brought the

latent ethnic hatreds, for so long suppressed, violently to the surface.

Gorbachev lectured Soviet miners that their strike action was “plunging the country into social chaos”. What hypocrisy. It is his turn to capitalism which has made queues outside shops longer and helped the rise of nationalist movements in the Baltic republics, and Pamyat, the modern day Black Hundreds, in Russia. It is not the miners which have plunged the Soviet Union into social chaos, it is Gorbachev and the pro-capitalist wing of the bureaucracy.

So while Gorbachev still basks in the popular acclaim he receives from bourgeois public opinion in the west, it is not surprising that in the Soviet Union itself his standing has been steadily eroded. Good!

The growing realisation that Gorbachev’s answers do not work has inevitably produced negative forms in the first place. Nonetheless there exists a gut level hatred of capitalism in the USSR. And as shown by the strikes by miners in Siberia and in the Ukraine, the working class — the class that made the Great October Revolution — is at last on the move.

Naturally, as the strikes are spontaneous the miners’ demands are full of contradictions. Yet it is clear that a relatively high level of consciousness exists. They wanted political as well as economic changes. Miners established their own workers’ committees which took charge of negotiations with the government, prevented drunkenness by closing drink shops and generally policed the area. A splendid display of proletarian discipline.

Until Gorbachev issued his threats to the miners, the Gorbachevites had attempted to claim the strike as an example of perestroika “from below” (*Sovietskaya Rossiya*). But it is quite clear that the miners have no time for the Gorbachevite leadership nor for capitalism. At their mass meetings they booed down Mikhail Shechadov, the minister for the Coal Industry, along with a spokesman from the openly pro-capitalist Democratic Union. Again good!

Developments in Poland and Hungary (and by implication the USSR) have caused deep misgivings in Romania, the GDR, Albania, Cuba and Czechoslovakia. Unfortunately the leaders here do not have any sort of worked out critique, let alone programme of action. As we have argued, socialism cannot stand still. In the end it must either retreat back to capitalism *a la* Gorbachev or it must move forward along the road towards communism, through extending mass proletarian democracy to the limits, to the point where it negates itself.

Centrist opposition to Gorbachevism is at best a holding operation; and if truth be told, batten down the hatches on open debate only further alienates the masses and gives the forces of restorationism the banner of democ-

racy free of charge.

What is needed in the USSR is a political revolution. Not the sort of political revolution Gorbachev claims he is leading, but a political revolution *against* Gorbachev. Such a revolution would transform not only the USSR and the dire situation in Eastern Europe but would have the same world shaking impact October 1917 did. For this to happen the working class in the Soviet Union must go beyond spontaneity. It needs a genuine communist leadership.

We will support the revolutionary struggle of the Soviet proletariat in any way we can, not least by fighting to make revolution in our own country. Above all, though, because we recognise that the world revolution is indivisible and that due to the traitor Gorbachev the gains for the world revolution won in October 1917, and those won in the wake of the Red Army’s defeat of the German Wehrmacht in 1945, are in imminent danger, we raise the slogan of the *unconditional defence* of the socialist countries.

It seems that in Britain we are almost unique in this. Given the still very limited weight our organisation carries within the workers’ movement, this is more than a pity. Defence of socialism needs class action.

In the meantime we will use the sword of polemic against those who, although they say they will make a revolution in Britain, refuse to defend revolutions that exist in concrete reality. In taking on these petty bourgeois revolutionaries and defeating them, we clear the ground for the reformed Communist Party of Great Britain, which will defend the socialist countries (yes, even those with the most monstrous bureaucratic deformations) in deed as well as word.

The left in Britain is a sorry sight. To begin with, a whole swathe of Trotskyites love Gorbachev. Certainly most gave Solidarnosc their full backing, as they did the counterrevolutionary butchers in Afghanistan. As to the RCP and the SWP (from which the former originated), they do not think that the great wars and struggles of the twentieth century have produced anything worth defending. ‘Official communism’ is little better.

Around the world ‘official communism’ is visibly decomposing before our very eyes. It is losing mass support hand over fist and has certainly lost all moral authority. The Euros have jumped on the Gorbachev bandwagon while the *Morning Star*, *New Worker* and Straight Leftist types try and pretend that nothing untoward is happening. Either that or they maintain a criminal silence. Their death knell sounds. Those who cannot defend the past will have no future.

Jack Conrad



Fortnightly paper of the Leninists:
for a genuine Communist Party

IN THE LAST two editions we have dealt with the complex new political situation. The rise in militancy, the revival in Labour's fortunes, the Tories' loss of popularity, etc., etc. Of course we are not alone in making these observations. After all, facts are facts. They are not the unique possession of one class, let alone one trend in the communist movement. Where our uniqueness lies is in the ability to put today's developments into class/historic context and locate Labour's left as our most important opponent in winning militant workers to communist consciousness.

But the purpose of this editorial is not to reiterate our analysis, let alone to praise our ability to get to grips with concrete developments well before others. Now what we want to do is to briefly (very briefly) question the performance of other significant left groups and trends.

Surely there should be some very searching, and very self critical, examinations of past positions. Unfortunately this is not what we get. It's business as usual.

As the *Militant*, *Morning Star*, *New Worker* and *Straight Left* types never did much thinking, let alone analysis, this is hardly surprising. But what of *Marxism Today*? After all, it has made its reputation (at least with the liberal bourgeoisie) by prattling on about a Thatcherite cultural revolution and the end of the working class.

Suddenly, though, Labour stands 14 percentage points ahead of the Tories and the working class has begun to stir (and in the process brought London to a standstill). Revealingly, the July edition of *Marxism Today* played dumb. It preferred to carry articles on Billy Graham, summer romances and how China is a 'Francoist military dictatorship'.

What of the petty bourgeois revolutionaries? Years ago most of them became left advisors to the Labour Party. This produces apologia, not principle. The main honourable (albeit partial) exceptions are the SWP and the RCP.

Throughout the 1980's the SWP has been insisting that there was a 'downturn in the class struggle'. Yes, that includes the miners' Great Strike: an 'extreme example of what we call the downturn' (Tony Cliff). This extreme example of what we call defeatism led WP members - a classic case of lions led by donkeys - to the most self fulfilling conclusions.

In recent editions of *Socialist Worker*, however, the SWP has been telling us all about the 'new mood' which has recently developed in the working class. Thank goodness! Yet nowhere can we find a reference to the 'downturn'. Has it come to an end? It still operating? Is it the beginning of the end? Not a word.

How about the RCP? It is undoubtedly a dynamic organisation, if not a Communist Party. The RCP has long been trying to convince us that the official labour movement is 'dead'. Apparently it passed away sometime in the mid-1980s, ie when the RCP decided not to organise any more marches on/lobbies of the TUC. Ridiculous, like the SWP's downturn nonsense, its only saving grace was that it was *not* aimed at producing passivity.

The RCP consists mainly of students who have no experience of the labour movement. To keep them on the boil and in the 'party', reality had to be denied and a mechanical fantasy world created in a mirror image of the method of Gerry Healy's WRP. For the RCP, the vanguard role does not need to be won. It would fall into the lap of Dr 'Death' Richards by default simply because all other forces are childishly declared 'dead'. Yet now that the Labour Party, along with working class self confidence, are on the up, we get not the slightest hint of self criticism from the RCP.

In all honesty, all you comrades, there is nothing wrong with being wrong. But there is something wrong, very wrong, when one has proved one wrong, in not admitting it. Those who cannot see of no long term use to the working class.

The Editor

REVIEWS

Kinnockism

Who can doubt that the Labour Party is the party - and the government - of crisis. One backbench Tory MP has already spoken of 'handing over this mess' for Kinnock to sort out. A straw in the wind yes but far from unique. In the *Observer* Richard Ingrams (late of *Private Eye*) suggests that Murdoch and his media empire might desert Thatcher: 'big businessmen do not allow sentiment to interfere with profit'.

As comrade Sherriff points out in *The Leninist* No 79 - Kinnock's chances have improved. And again as the comrade says no one should have any illusions in Kinnock or the Labour.

Historically Labour has always been called in by the bourgeoisie 'to clear up the mess' and keep workers quiet. In 1924 Labour was allowed to take over the mess left in the wake of World War I; again in 1929 until it became so bad that the Labour tops were forced to split their party and go over to the bourgeoisie. In 1945 - when the prospect of a Churchill Tory government would have been laughable Labour came in as it did in the 1960s and 70s with Wilson and Callaghan dealing with proletarian unrest. So why not Kinnock now that he has pledged to 'make capitalism work' - what a hope.

Tony Eastman

Labourism

Congratulations to David Sherriff on his article 'To kill capital: fight Kinnockism' (*The Leninist* 79). Not only did he place the Labour Party and its 'left' supporters, both within and without the party, into correct perspective, but he also correctly related the revolutionary left to that of Labour reformism.

As Sherriff correctly states: 'He [Kinnock] will not dash the socialist illusions of the masses with the awful reality of Labourism after their votes have got it into office, because he is not sowing any socialistic illusions'. This correct presentation of the reality of the situation explodes the Trotskyist myth of elect Labour and expose it through presenting it with socialist demands.

How can one 'expose' it as being non socialist, and with what value, when it proudly declares itself to be a non socialist but humane reforming capitalist party, and will be supported into office on such a basis?

It was nearly seventy years ago when Lenin wrote *Left Wing Communism* and advocated the tactic of supporting Labour to power 'as a rope supports a hanged man'. Without consideration of changed historical circumstances, and the conditions Lenin enunciated for the validity of his tactic, the Trotskyists advocate the tactic parrot fashion. As such, they transform what was and what can be a revolutionary tactic into a reactionary and sterile slogan.

The conditions laid down by Lenin in *Left Wing Communism* for the application of his tactic were: (a) that the conditions for a revolutionary situation were maturing; (b) that the Labour leaders were 'afraid to win' power alone; (c) that the creation of soviets was on the order of the day; (d) that a parallel existed between conditions in Britain in 1920 and revolutionary Russia in 1917.

Under these circumstances it was obvious that the election of a

Labour government giving lip service to the ideals of socialism and a workers government would have unleashed a great revolutionary energy from the ranks of the working class.

The traumatic effect of a Labour (workers') government not only failing to implement basic socialist ideals but actually siding with the bosses against the workers, as they would have had to have done to preserve capital, would have created the conditions for what Lenin envisaged as 'serious chances of success to overthrow the government of Henderson at once...' (my emphasis). To suggest any similarity between the conditions in 1920 and those since is to falsify Leninism and distort the Marxist scientific method of analysis. And let it be noted that support for the election of a Labour government does not in any way entail support for the government itself. On the contrary, the aim is its overthrow.

Correctly, David Sherriff declares: 'Under certain specific circumstances we would support the election of a Labour government; if the socialist pretensions of Labour needed exposing in order to let working class combativity go to higher levels' (emphasis in original). This is in complete harmony with Lenin's concept as stated above, and expresses a true Leninist approach.

P Conlon
South London

USSR

MG Malkin's letter in issue 78 implies that *The Leninist* describes 'the entire 19 million members of the CPSU as "bureaucrats"'. To the best of my knowledge, no comrade has done this. The party does not have to comprise, in its entirety, or even in a majority, of bureaucrats to be a party of the bureaucracy, any more than the Labour Party in Britain has to comprise of bourgeois for it to be a bourgeois party.

The ability of the bureaucratic form of the plan to develop the forces of production has run its course. A society must be judged on the basis of its ability to develop production. Growth rates are now lower in the Soviet Union than in the west. The only way that this can be rectified is through the introduction of democratic planning at all levels of Soviet society. But because this would undermine the position of the bureaucracy it will not countenance it.

Communists who want to really defend the USSR must support the call for political revolution. Comrade Malkin tries to sidestep this, through talk of a 'moral revolution'. At least the comrade has the honesty not to try and invoke the name of Marx in his favour. Instead he falls back on the last refuge of a lost argument: 'human nature'.

Alan Merrik
London

Pamyat

I note that in recent issues reference is made to Pamyat, the fascist organisation in the Soviet Union. I share your loathing of fascists and I am at a loss to understand why the Soviet authorities and people allow this scum to exist. But I note also, that while you are consistent in your opposition and condemnation of Pamyat, you ignore the growing threat that fascist organisations pose to socialists and ethnic mino-

rities here, in this country.

Despite the fact that racist attacks run at the rate of 70,000 per year and the fascists are gaining more and more white working class youth, it seems to be the trend amongst the left in this country to shrug the shoulder and look the other way. It is an attitude I can't understand. The fascists have developed strong links with loyalists in the occupied six counties and meet frequently with American and European Nazi organisations. It is not the weather they talk about, I'm sure.

It seems to be a contradiction to exhort the Soviet people to rid themselves of Pamyat whilst ignoring the growing threat of fascism here. I would welcome clarification on this matter.

Sean Davies
London

'Puzzled'

I was puzzled by your letter of April 10 [see the last issue of *The Leninist*] regarding the Labour Party's 'Time To Go' demonstration. We cannot understand why you attach such significance to the event. Your enthusiasm for a relatively minor gesture seems to indicate that you actually believe the organiser's public relations material that there will be 10-20,000 on the march. Probably from your point of view it would make more sense to organise an anti-imperialist section of the audience of the pop concert to be held afterwards. That will indeed attract large numbers!

Whether or not to mobilise for an opportunist demonstration on Ireland is a question of tactics. In the present conditions it makes no sense to mobilise an anti-imperialist contingent for a march that is decidedly equivocal on the question of imperialism. Instead of playing at tactics it makes more sense to devote our energy to winning support for an anti-imperialist initiative. That's why we shall be mobilising for the August 5 anti-imperialist commemorative demonstration.

We think that after your less than fruitful tactical orientation towards the CPGB you would think twice about intervening in another corpse. If you decide to go ahead with your naive initiative - good luck.

Should you rethink we are always ready to welcome your contribution to the only anti-imperialist march on Ireland this summer on August 5.

Phil Murphy
Irish Freedom Movement

David Sherriff replies:

Phil Murphy, like the rest of the RCP, seems to be obsessed with corpses. As he well knows the 'Time To Go' demonstration on August 12 will draw most of its support from petty bourgeois left groups such as the SWP. Not to challenge their adaption to Labourism would in our view be criminal. That is why we sponsored the formation of Hands off Ireland! and called for the organisation of a genuinely anti-imperialist contingent.

Note: Letters have been shortened due to lack of space. For political security we have changed certain names, addresses and details.

WRITE OR RING

If you would like to reply to any of these letters, raise questions or comment on articles in *The Leninist* please write to The Editor, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX. Or phone us on 01-431 3135.

Six month subscription rates: Britain and Ireland £5; Europe £8; Rest of World £10 (airmail £17.50). Annual subscription rates: Britain and Ireland £10; Institutions £20; Europe £16; Institutions £26; Rest of World £20 (airmail £35); Institutions £34 (airmail £45). Back copies: Issues 1-6 (theoretical journal) £1 each plus 25p p&p. All cheques payable to November Publications Ltd. Printed by: Press Link International (UK) Ltd (TU). Published by: November Publications, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX copyright July 1989 ISSN 0262-1649

Anti-imperialist unity

We urge all anti-imperialists to unite on August 12. We have been urging this for the last year and actively working for it. That is why we sponsored the setting up of Hands Off Ireland! The larger the HOI! contingent, the sooner we will build the mass solidarity campaign the Irish masses so richly deserve

THE LAST last lap of 'Time To Go' is underway. Local committees of this campaign have been cobbled together to parade Clare Short MP, Peter Hain and various Socialist Workers Party hacks around the country to explain why it is in British best interests to withdraw, like good little ex-colonialists, from the north of Ireland. This culminates in the march, rally and carnival of August 12.

The launch pad of this was the 'Time To Go Show' in June. Seven hundred odd British leftists turned out – in spite of the £15 entrance fee – to listen to the aforementioned Labourites, SWPers plus some others, and pick the nits out of each others egos. Hands Off Ireland! was also there, giving its comrades a chance to take on followers of the party which sent in the troops in the first place.

According to the organisers of 'TTG' its show took "support for British withdrawal from Ireland into the mainstream of British politics and society" (quoted from the latest edition of *Labour and Ireland*).

Members of the SWP, *Socialist Organiser* and the Labour Committee on Ireland will no doubt be flattered by this description, as they comprised the overwhelming majority of the conference. The reaction to this conference – at which 'TTG' supporters repeatedly emphasised that they were not talking about an immediate troop withdrawal – was in many ways more revealing than the conference itself, which was sadly distracted from the business of taking up the chauvinist platform of 'TTG' by the rabidly pro-imperialist "bloodbath" line of *Socialist Organiser*. *Labour and Ireland* was determined to make the best of a bad job: "Those who attended reflected the breadth of support Time To Go has been able to muster."

The journal attempts to use this make believe array of eager anti-imperialists as a stick to beat those, like HOI!, who stand by a principled position: "Those on the left who have spent the last year warning of the danger of the campaign's 'revisionism', that it was not 'pure' enough or was prepared to accept support from any quarter had their answer not just from the attendance [!] but by several speakers, including Gerry Adams, who addressed the dire need to overcome such factional traditions".

Sinn Féin's president did indeed call for a broad campaign. Mere invocation of the man's name, though, does not flatten all opposi-

tion. And it is instructive to look at the way in which Adams posed the question: "The Irish people have the right to national self-determination. Or broader still: does the British administration in Ireland play a useful role in Irish interests."

Speaking from the floor, a Hands Off Ireland! comrade pointed out that support for Irish self-determination could only mean unconditional defence of the right of the Irish people to fight for self-determination, in whatever way they choose.

Given that the leaders of 'TTG' are on record for their many anti-republican statements on the armed struggle, and that the campaign itself has avoided the issue of the armed struggle and of IRA and Inla prisoners of war, it can hardly claim to fall within even this "broad base". And, if 'TTG' agrees with Adams when he says that Britain plays a reactionary role in Ireland, why does it not demand troops out now? Does it perhaps agree with *Socialist Organiser's* 'bloodbath' scenario?

The only correct perspective on which to build a mass campaign to end British occupation is on the two demands 'troops out now' and 'self-determination for the Irish people'. 'Time To Go' rejects both of these point blank. Yet for democrats, let alone socialists, these two demands, like Irish freedom, are not negotiable. They are principles.

Hands Off Ireland! was established to give these principles flesh through organisation. Its aim is to build the largest possible anti-imperialist contingent on the August 12 'TTG' march. It has fought for this in the unions and on the streets, through the active intervention of its supporters and its publications.

In May it organised a very successful national speaking tour with the sacked head of the Irish Distributive and Administrative Trade Union, John Mitchell, who had been witch-hunted for his support for Irish freedom. This is being followed up this month with another speaking tour, this time with Eamon Mullen of the Irish Republican Socialist Party (see the In Struggle column), who recently overturned his exclusion order from Britain.

HOI!'s principled and non-sectarian stand has brought together anti-imperialist activists and drawn fresh people around its banners. We have every confidence that such work can establish the roots of a mass solidarity movement, not by trailing along behind 'TTG', but by mounting a direct

challenge to it.

Others on the left have tried to deal with 'TTG' in their own way. The boycottist RCP, having decided that the official labour movement is "dead", is ignoring this 'corpse', and trying to explain how one of its co-residents in the mortuary, the mainstream Labour Party, can rise and win the Euro elections. Enough said.

The Troops Out Movement, true to form, is trying to straddle two horses and getting a nasty case of groin strain in the process. Late in the day, it decided (after, in true sectarian style, trying to ignore HOI!) to organise its own contingent under the two slogans. As usual this has been fudged, just as it fudges its own formally correct platform. Typically it states, "Time To Go have established important new ground" (*Troops Out*, July).

What new ground might this be? A cursory glance at its platform reveals a rehash of the tired old 'Bill of Rights' formula. 'TTG' is a patriotic campaign which argues that it is in Britain's best interest to leave Ireland. True anti-imperialists want to see Britain leave Ireland in the same way that the US left Vietnam, clinging to the skirts of its helicopters. *Defeated!*

And then we have *Workers Power*. Now, here's a funny case. This month's edition of its paper has a call to "build the anti-imperialist contingent". But this is not Hands Off Ireland! It is one which they have thrown together with other Labour Party entrists; the Workers International League and Revolutionary Internationalist League, two organisations which probably enjoy more initials than they do members.

They do this on the basis of having carried out no work for it over the past year, and having refused to agree to the eminently reasonable and broad HOI! founding statement. Having carried out what amounted to an act of sectarian splitting then, it now has the hypocrisy to "call on all these forces to maximise support for the [ie, WP's] anti-imperialist contingent". Such sectarian posturing will sicken all genuine anti-imperialists.

We urge all anti-imperialists to unite on August 12. We have been urging this and actively working for it for the last year. That is why HOI! was established. The larger the HOI! contingent, the sooner we will build the mass solidarity campaign the Irish masses so richly deserve. In the struggle for this there is no room for sectarianism, even when it poses under the banner of anti-sectarianism.

Alan Merrik

Britain has consistently tried to silence Irish revolutionaries – by legislation, prison and, when all else fails, through its army and loyalist assassins. The Irish Republican Socialist Party was in the past hard hit by all three. And on top of that in the late eighties the government has systematically excluded from Britain representatives of the IRSP. For instance, in February comrade Eamon Mullen was excluded. But in April, he won his appeal against this; one of only three people to gain such a victory. Hands Off Ireland! is organising a speaking tour to enable the comrade to exercise his restored 'freedom', to prove that the voice of Irish revolutionaries will not be silenced. You can hear the comrade speak at HOI! meetings in London, Friday July 21 7.30pm, Conway Hall, Red Lion Square; Manchester, Monday 24, 7.30pm, Town Hall; Liverpool, Tuesday 25 (phone for details); Sheffield, Wednesday 26 7.30pm, Mountpleasant Community Centre, Sharrow Lane; Doncaster, Thursday 27 7.30pm, Women's Centre Cleveland St and Chesterfield. Friday 28 (details to be announced). At all meetings there will be a speaker from HOI! and plenty of time for discussion. Come along – hear and debate how we advance in Britain and in Ireland! For more information contact HOI! on (01) 431 3135

In the last issue of *The Leninist* we covered the plight of Kurdish and Alevi refugees in Britain, fleeing from repression in Turkey only to be faced with racist persecution by the British state. On Saturday July 29 at 12.30pm in Clissold Park, Stoke Newington Church Street, in London the Turkish and Kurdish communities will be pulling out thousands in support of the refugees. We hope that the response of the workers movement in Britain will come up to what is necessary. Certainly, *The Leninist* will be mobilising a contingent on the demonstration. No worker is illegal. We should fight to smash all immigration controls. Be there on the day and march with us. Back in Turkey the resistance and combativity is gaining strength. The forms of struggle thrown forward is something that workers in Britain can learn from, especially as wide sections here are now entering into struggle. The Committee for the Defence of Democratic Rights in Turkey is organising a rank and file delegation of trade unionists to Turkey to learn from the fight there and to build links between workers fighting in Turkey and in Britain. The CDDRT is appealing for donations to make this delegation possible. The door is also still open for prospective delegates. If you are interested, contact Max Hirons at CDDRT, 84 Balls Pond Rd, London N1 4AJ. Tel: (01) 254 0387.

The Iranian Political Prisoners Action Committee was recently subject to a sectarian exclusion by the Campaign Against Repression in Iran. At the 'Voices for Rushdie' meeting on June 23 Ippac had its literature stall closed by Cari officials, one Ippac supporter was refused admission to the meeting and other supporters were dissuaded from speaking. The 'justification' for this from Cari was that supporters of Ippac were members of the 'official communist' Tudeh Party and its fellow travellers in the Fedaiian Majority. Cari also stated that Ippac supporters had attended a meeting with members of Tudeh. This response has nothing to do with concern for security against Tudeh (which rightly has a bad reputation on this score). It is a cynical attempt to exclude a 'competing' organisation from the scene by tarring it, by association, with the same brush as Iranian 'official communists'. All those concerned with building a powerful movement in solidarity with those struggling against reaction in Iran must take a stand against such an attitude. Ippac has done important work. For instance, the role it played in breaking the British media's silence over the mass executions in Iran last year. And, we should remember, unlike Cari or Tudeh, it defends all imprisoned progressives and democrats and has never at any stage given support to the Khomeini regime. For further information on Ippac's activities, write to Ippac, BCM Box 6926, London WC1N 3XX.

More comrades



Comrades, so far this month our £600 fighting fund is well down. All we have in is £312. As things stand therefore things look bleak. We are unlikely to meet our target. In part this is due to the fact that our closest supporters are channelling all their financial resources into our £20,000 Sixth Summer Offensive. Nonetheless it also shows us that there exists a considerable gap between the core of our organisation – based in London – and the mass of our readership. This is something we will overcome, step by step, as we begin to organise outside London.



Workers from Turkey showing their proletarian internationalism in London on May Day. Now is the time for British workers to show their solidarity

China and



Mao in 1940: organising a revolution

The horrific sight of the People's Liberation Army turning on the people has not only proved the bankruptcy of the leadership of the Communist Party of China. It has done the same thing for much of the left in Britain

GREAT EVENTS test all programmes and pretensions. In the class struggle in Britain, the miners Great Strike was a great test. It exposed many a flimsy theory to the ultimate criticism of the real world. This is the sort of thing to which Marx referred when he said that one strike was worth a thousand programmes. But tests also come from the 'outside'. How groups and parties will face up to the future tasks in their own country can be seen in advance, in the stand taken on great international issues.

Over the past twenty years, the Irish war has proved the spinelessness of many petty bourgeois left groups and the subservience of all reformists to the forces of imperialism. Those who refuse to stand against the British army and with the IRA will never make revolution in Britain. The same is true of those who refuse, or are unable, to defend the gains of the world revolution in the form of the socialist states.

This, argued the Comintern in 1920, was a sacred duty for all communists. Defence of the socialist states was for it a fundamental criterion of proletarian internationalism. Of course, various opportunist trends can go on for years paying lip service to the need to unconditionally defend the gains of the working class. Only when put to the test through wars and the threat of counterrevolution do they shrug off their claimed ideological orthodoxy for the more comfortable 'neither capitalism nor socialism' revisionism of Tony Cliff, Max Shachtman, Hillel Ticktin etc.

Poland in the early 1980s was a particularly hard test. Through bureaucratic bungling the Polish United Workers Party had totally alienated the masses. Far from turning to revolutionary solutions they flocked to Solidarnosc. It openly put itself forward as an agency for capitalist restoration and received moral and material aid from across the whole spectrum of reaction, from the Vatican to the CIA, because of it.

Yet, in spite of this, virtually the whole of the petty bourgeois, predominantly Trotskyist, left supported it and marched with Polish emigre ultra rightists through the streets of London protesting when it was banned under martial law in 1981. One group even mimicked Solidarnosc's logo on the masthead of its now defunct paper. The opportunists preferred to line up with counterrevolution rather than defend the gains of socialism and risk losing members brought up on one dimensional anti-capitalism.

The crisis in China has found the left in Britain equally lacking in principle. The horrific sight of the Peoples Liberation Army turning on the people has not only proved the bankruptcy of the leadership of the Communist Party of China. It has done the same thing for much of the left in Britain.

Developments in China are very contradictory. The democracy movement was very heterogeneous, and could therefore develop in any direction, not least counterrevolution. News of Chinese student leaders popping up in Paris demanding that the western powers break off relations with Beijing and impose economic sanctions certainly indicates a turn to the right rather than the left. No communist should pretend this is not the case.

Socialist Organiser will have none of this. Its coverage of China reflected its infamous anti-communism and Labourism, as it attempted to further ingratiate itself with the grossly anti-socialist Labour Party ('our party' to them). This paper does not seem to know what China is, apart from the fact that it doesn't like it. As to the SWP, it was no surprise to see it trot out its hack 'neither east nor west' line: unimaginative, predictable and needing no intellectual exertion. It dropped all pretence of defending socialism way back during the Korean war.

The motivation with the above two groups has far more to do with playing to chauvinism in Britain than any concern to delve into the realities of Chinese society. Others, like Mili-

tant and the Spartacist League, argue that the political revolution has begun. If the iron wheels of history stick, or even move back a little, let's just *imagine* they are moving on. But two trends in particular have presented themselves as being especially fraught with contradictions in their responses to the rebellion in China. These are the Revolutionary Communist Party and the 'official communists' in Britain.

Whom the gods wish to destroy...

The Revolutionary Communist Party has perhaps produced the most bizarre commentary on the events in China to date. Not for the first time, the real world has exposed the manifold contradictions of this well packaged student sect (which has its origins as a Trotskyite opposition in what is now the SWP).

For the RCP there is nothing whatsoever to defend in the Chinese revolution. It is a "Stalinist regime" governed by a "bureaucratic elite". Now, this may get you a pat on the head in a sociology lecture, but such aimless petty bourgeois meanderings do not take you very far when it comes to an analysis of Chinese society. When the RCP attempts even a pretence at such an analysis, it gets hopelessly lost.

Its leader, Frank Richards, seems at first glance to accept that there was a "revolution in 1949" (*the next step*, June 2). Of course, he isn't nearly so ambitious as to try and tell you what sort of society this revolution ushered in, but he does at least appear to recognise that one took place.

This is not the case with his comrades. Joan Phillips, the paper's editor, refers to "a counterrevolution, in which a bureaucratic elite came to power by keeping the masses down" (*the next step*, June 9). Again in *the next step* of June 16 an unsigned 'message to supporters' tells its followers that the "1949 counterrevolution which brought the Stalinist bureaucracy to power was made possible only by the defeat inflicted on the massive working class movement in Shanghai and Canton in 1927. The bureaucratic regime which emerged in China in the post war years stands as a monument to counterrevolution. It has nothing to do with communism."

To assert this, you would think that the RCP was duty bound to explain how the revolutionary CPC of the '20s was transformed into the 'counterrevolutionary' vehicle of 1949. It does not.

Were the communist cadres executed by the Guomindang in 1927 engaging in a cynical counterrevolutionary plot? Was the heroic Long March of the Chinese communists the first step down the road to the counterrevolution? The article seems to miss the vital point that it was not the CPC which inflicted this defeat on the working class, but the Party itself which had the counterrevolutionary hand of the Guomindang turned on it.

There can be no doubt that the opportunist mistakes of the Party and Comintern were not unimportant, but it does not alter this key fact one iota. It is to the Party's eternal credit that, under the leadership of Mao, it was able to reorganise itself after the 1927 debacle and go on to victory in the 1949 revolution.

The RCP's arse-backwards formulation, instead of demystifying the world, can only pose yet more insoluble questions for those naive enough to swallow its gibberish. What was this 'counterrevolution' in capitalist China - a return to oriental despotism? Maybe even primitive communism? Surely we are entitled to know.

To be able to describe the qualitative leap represented by the defeat of native big capital, feudalism and foreign imperialism by the com-

and the left

manist led Peoples Liberation Army as a counterrevolution is to turn reality on its head. Likewise to brand the collectivisation of agriculture and nationalisation of industry, Mao's 'iron ricebowl', the guarantee of a basic standard of living to the masses from whom it was before denied, as the results of a "counterrevolution" is truly a bizarre turn to subjective idealism. Still, those whom the gods wish to destroy, they first make mad.

The RCP undertakes no analysis of the events of 1949, nor indeed, in any real sense, of today to justify this 'analysis'. Instead, it tries to dishonestly lump in China with the Soviet Union. I say dishonestly because it has in the past rejected such an approach. There is no way, after all, that its analysis of the USSR as a qualitative degeneration of a once healthy workers' revolution can be squared with that of the outright 'counterrevolution' in China, which apparently never established a workers' state. The RCP gives specific reasons for the 'strange evolution' of the USSR that it describes, which did not exist in China. Nonetheless the results are meant to be the same.

According to Lenin, this is the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Yet according to the RCP the Soviet Union along with all the socialist states of Asia and Eastern Europe, and not forgetting Cuba, have nothing to do with socialism. What on earth has gone wrong? For us, nothing. Leninism is powerful because it is true. Lenin was correct and therefore still relevant. The socialist states, for all their bureaucratic deformations, are products of revolution (even if often from above) and have to be unconditionally defended. For the RCP though, because reality is too dirty and complex obviously Lenin has to be wrong.

We have to ask the RCP, prior to the 1949 'counterrevolution', what was the social basis of the 'bureaucratic elite'? What privilege did it enjoy? No doubt the same 'privileges' as the same 'bureaucratic elites' in Cuba before 1959: dysentery, malaria, malnutrition and day to day resistance against an overwhelmingly better armed enemy.

The conclusions that this 'party' draws from its threadbare predictions on China are unequivocally reactionary. As far as it is concerned, because there is nothing worth defending in Chinese society, any movement against the state bureaucracy is all to the good. "regardless of its political character" (the next step, May 26). One wonders if those Chinese workers and students who demonstrated in Tiananmen Square with pictures of Mao Zedong share this objectively counterrevolutionary view.

This was no slip. The following week Richards came forward to reinforce the line, he had obviously 'refined' his attitude to the 1949 revolution. "Although it is politically incoherent," he wrote "the protest movement is essentially a progressive force. The direction of this movement is still unclear - it could move either to the left or to the right. But regardless of its future direction, Marxists must support any popular mobilisation against the bureaucracy ... Regardless of the short term consequences, the overthrow of the Chinese bureaucracy would be the best result for Marxists" (Ibid, June 2).

No genuine communist could share this view. Lenin wrote that the only true internationalism was to work for the development of the revolutionary struggle in one's own country and to support "this struggle, this, and only this, line, in every country without exception." (CW, Vol 24, p75).

Are the forces for capitalist restoration part of the "mobilisation against the bureaucracy"? Of course! Such a line of supporting any movement, irrespective of its political perspective, has very dangerous implications for the future of the RCP. If you accept such a position abroad, why not at home? At best, this brings you to a farcical shadow of the Communist Party of Germany's "after Hitler

us" stance. At worst it ends up as crude anti-communism.

The justification for this highly dubious line is even stranger. Richards puts the case in the next step of June 30: "In the past, Marxists believed correctly that such a defeat for Stalinism would represent a victory for the imperialists. But in the contemporary world, the unpredictable forces unleashed by the decline of Stalinism threaten to upset the global equilibrium as a whole."

What past Marxists were these and, more's the point, what has changed of late? It is possible that RCP member Andy Clarkson is such a Marxist from the past, but writing in Richards' "contemporary world", since he has been arguing that the break up of the USSR under the centripetal forces of nationalism will only aid imperialism. And while it is true that a China racked by turmoil, whether counterrevolutionary or revolutionary, would upset Richards' "global equilibrium", a counterrevolutionary outcome allowing the unfettered entry of capital into China would certainly be in imperialism's interests.

Wherever possible, the RCP has shied away from even formal proletarian internationalism, supporting the development of the revolutionary working class movement worldwide. For it, revolutionary tasks are confined between Lands End and John O'Groats.

When, as in China, the outside world rudely intrudes, these petty bourgeois are left floundering. In Poland in 1981 they stood aside when Solidarnosc threatened counterrevolution. Their position on Afghanistan was little different. Now they go further, arguing that workers should countenance support for an overtly counterrevolutionary force in China.

Workers should, to say the least, be very wary of an organisation which not only refuses to recognise a revolution but then goes on to support counterrevolution. As to RCP members, they ought to take a long hard look at where their increasingly oddball political positions are taking them. Comrades, it is a very dangerous trajectory.

Deng's comrades?

The most distinctive thing about the reaction of 'official communists' to the crisis in China has been its complete confusion. Answers are something you will not find in the pages of the various 'official communist' house journals, from the Euros to the New Communist Party. The crisis of Chinese 'official communism' is aptly reflected in the British variant. After thirty years of hostility they are united - at least in their mutual bankruptcy.

The initial reactions were very fragmentary. The Euro 7 Days responded in a typically impotent manner ('Weeping for China', June 10) which was distinguishable from the bourgeois liberal press only by the appalling standard of its journalism. There is no analysis of the events, no understanding of causes, just hand wringing and crocodile tears.

The Morning Star has by and large confined itself to reporting on events, with the very minimum of comment attached. One would have got more 'meat' by reading it straight from Reuters or Press Association. This so-called 'communist' newspaper is quite clearly paralysed by indecision. The nearest one comes to learning what it thinks is by looking at the sort of language the Star's correspondent, Roger Trask, used in his reporting, referring to the use of troops against the students on June 4 as a "massacre" and a "bloody crackdown".

Along with 7 Days, Trask cites condemnations of the army's action by various communist parties internationally to give his reportage a little borrowed authority. So

Trask disapproves of the killing of the students by the 27th Army. But, given the importance of this, his implied criticisms are incredibly mealy mouthed. The editorials of the same paper in general feel that it is safer to leave things well enough alone. If it doesn't fit your comforting dogma, ignore it.

The only lengthy comment on this situation in the Star has been, not from a British writer, but from an American, the CPUSA general secretary Gus Hall, in the June 28 edition. One supposes that this is to ensure that any embarrassing cock-ups this writer may make cannot be laid at the feet of Star editor Tony Chater, as the poor innocent is merely performing his diplomatic internationalist duty.

Some people, though, will never have the minimum common sense necessary to keep their jaws clamped tight when advisable. One such is Tom Durkin, CPBer and self propelled megaphone. He gushes fulsomely in favour of Hall's article in the Star's letters column of July 4.

The events of Tiananmen Square have sent many centrists scuttling off to their bookshelves to dust off their 1960s Novosti pamphlets, explaining how China is in the grip of "feudal fascist reaction" (or some equally eclectic vitriol) and that Mao is a complete bastard with nothing to do with communism. Gus Hall still has the hangover from this, branding Mao a pro-American, anti-communist ... and since the mid 1930s at that!

Hall at least seems to accept, in line with the present Soviet leadership, that under this pro-American anti-communist, China became some kind of socialist country - which, incidentally, is more than the right centrist New Communist Party seems to (maybe it can get together with the RCP and thrash out a suitably off the wall position). For Hall, though, if this is the case the knee jerk reaction is to condemn any opposition within this state.

It is this myopic attitude which Durkin finds so appealing: "Two developments in the Chinese students' activities gave cause for concern. First, the attempt to upstage the visit by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev which was an event of great significance after 30 years of acrimony and hostility between the two great socialist countries. Second, the upping of demands from democracy and the ending of corruption, to challenging the regime and role of all the Chinese Communist Party [sic]. Reaction, as Chile and many more examples show, knows how to exploit genuine concern to achieve directly opposite aims."

Durkin, after Hall, is really scrambling around to justify the actions of Deng and the Chinese state bureaucracy. How dare the masses spoil the Deng-Gorbachev party by demanding democratic rights! This brand of 'official communism' is irrevocably wedded to being a ginger group to bureaucracy, whether it be Ron Todd and Norman Willis in Britain or Gorbachev, Deng et al in the socialist countries. For them, it is not the masses which make history, as Marx argued, but individuals behind closed doors, whether bargaining for an extra 10% with the CBI or for arms agreements with the US.

Any infringement on this by the action of the masses, for Durkin and Co, deserves to be slapped down hard for spoiling the grand designs of 'great' statesmen. And they still have the effrontery to call themselves Marxists!

But, yes, in certain circumstances the masses can be mobilised on a counterrevolutionary programme. Poland and Solidarnosc is an example of this. To prove that the same problem existed in China the centrists have focussed in on that polystyrene Statue of Liberty.

Surely our 'official communists' can do better than that. Besides, even if you take this in the light that Durkin does - as a most damning indictment indeed - it has to be seen in the context of a Tiananmen Square awash with hundreds of thousands of students and

workers singing the Internationale and carrying the red banner of communism. There are reports of many advancing on tanks armed with no more than these two weapons. This is a million miles politically from the Catholic church and imperial eagles of Solidarnosc.

If there is anything that repels the masses from this course it will be the attitude of the Communist Party, whose actions have stained the name of communism with the blood of thousands on June 4. The Chinese masses made the revolution. It is theirs. If they become alienated from it, the blame lies squarely with the Chinese bureaucracy. Brecht's wry comment on 'electing a new people' rang out bitterly as the 27th Army attempted to do so down the barrel of a gun.

There are other reasons for many 'official communists' being slow to condemn the brutal crushing of the rebellion of the Chinese masses. Durkin alludes to it, but does not state it openly: Gorbachev.

7 Days can whinge that "at a time when there are exciting changes in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, holding up a prospect of communism which is humane and democratic as well as economically and socially just, the brutal actions unleashed by a section of the Chinese leadership in the name of 'the revolution' are a sickening blow to the hopes and aspirations of communists world-wide" (June 10), but is the traitor Gorbachev so different?

When the Sino-Soviet discussions opened in Beijing, the Morning Star led with a picture of Deng and Gorbachev, with a one word banner headline, "Comrades". Funny, they've been quiet on that one of late...

Perestroika is certainly comparable to the Chinese 'market socialism' economic reforms, the Four Modernisations. Is the divergence in wealth created by such policies "economically and socially just"? What of Gorbachev's reaction to the nationalist movements in the USSR? It does not take a genius to draw parallels between the methods used to suppress the nationalist movements in Tibet and Soviet Georgia. And as comrade Jack Conrad said in his speech launching The Leninist's Sixth Summer Offensive, because of perestroika: "The slaughter we have seen in Beijing could well be repeated in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev. Perestroika has got nothing to do with strengthening socialist democracy in the USSR. It is an anti-working class, anti-socialist programme which will strengthen the forces of capitalist restorationism. It is no different from Deng's Four Modernisations".

Mikhail Gorbachev implicitly recognised all this himself when he stated, in a speech on July 28 1986, that "we have similar priorities as China" (quoted in News and Views, September 20 1986). Indeed, the same journal, reporting the Euro CPGB delegation to China in February of this year, was very keen on Chinese developments. Well, friends, you have now seen where 'market socialism' leads.

The 'official communists' - of all hues - have a barren view of socialism; they have a hostility to the masses and are visibly sliding towards open bourgeois politics. These types can give no guidance to workers in Britain, whether it be the whimpers of the Euros or the embarrassment and confusion of the centrists.

All the old centrist certainties of the '50s and '60s have gone, along with the '70s false hopes of the Euros. 'Official communism' has been left high and dry. For all these pathetic specimens, coherence, any grasp of reality and even their raison d'etre has gone.

But we should still watch them carefully. They are the political manifestations of Gorbachevism in Britain. In proving themselves day by day more reactionary, they prove the same of the shabby politics of their mentor.

Alan Merrik

The British 'left' just shows its greens. From Neil Kinnock to the SWP it has become 'ozone friendly'. The flagging Labourites of Socialist Action have as the headline for their once weekly, now bi-monthly journal 'For a Red-Green Alliance'. And it can only be a matter of time before relatively large numbers of Euros decant to the Greens. They'll be among friends. We have unearthed a letter from the 1989 Green candidate for West Kent in the Euro elections, Jim Tidy, who polled 30,000 votes, in the Kent Post of February 24 1984. In this, Jim confesses to being a little upset at the National Front turning up at a local CND meeting to leaflet. Until, that is, he read the leaflet: "I was amazed to see how much we have in common ... I have supporters from every shade of opinion you can think of except the National Front. When will they put their money where their mouth is?" Could there be something in that old 'hand-in-glove of fascism' line after all?

We hear that part time general secretary of the Communist Party of Britain, Mike Hicks, has penned a letter to his Euro CPGB equivalent Gordon McLennan. This is not for unity talks or such like, but to protest at the latter's use of the name 'Communist Party'. Quite right, but then people in glass houses... It doesn't end here though. The Euros have responded by sending a solicitors letter back demanding that the CPB ceases using the British Road to Socialism as the name for its programme. Well, that they're quite welcome to, but they both ought to drop 'communism' to prevent any further confusion with the real thing.

A black and white illustration of a man in overalls looking up at a large gear hanging from the ceiling, symbolizing industry and progress. The man is standing on a small platform, looking up at a large gear hanging from the ceiling. The gear is connected to a series of pulleys and ropes. The man is wearing overalls and has a determined expression. The background is simple, with some lines suggesting a workshop or factory setting. The overall style is that of a political cartoon or a symbolic illustration.

COMRADES who took part in the London May Day march this year cannot fail to have noticed the large Turkish contingents. Indeed it stands to the shame of the communist movement in Britain that throughout the 1980s it has been Turkish, and not British, communists who have dominated the May Day marches in London.

This is not simply because there are ninety thousand Turks living in north east London, in the boroughs of Haringey, Hackney and Islington. They are a mere drop in the ocean of 12 to 15 million who populate London and its catchment area. No, these impressive May Day contingents are a sign of the militant class struggle in Turkey itself, overflowing onto the streets of London.

The workers' struggle in Turkey was set back by a fascist military coup in September 12 1980 and the ruthless repression during the three years of fascism which followed. Now it is welling up again.

Some readers will recall our solidarity work for the Netas strikers:

of Istanbul at the end of 1986 and early 1987. This was a strike of strategic significance, opening the way for the whole of Turkey's working class to return to militant action.

We used all the strength our organisation could muster in raising financial support from British workers. Turkish workers in the low paid sweatshops of East London, including illegal workers, were donating a week's wages, and that is what members and supporters of *The Leninist* did. That is the kind of self sacrifice which the class struggle demands. Communists must set an example, if others are to follow.

Netas broke the dam. Today there is a veritable strike wave and we believe all the evidence indicates that a revolutionary situation – which dominated Turkey's politics throughout the 1970s – will soon return. This time it will be in a sharper form, simply because the Turkish bourgeoisie cannot solve its problems; it has to turn inwards on to its own workers.

What this poses in Turkey is the task of this revolution and in turn the necessity of organising the communist vanguard which will make it happen. The Communist Party of Turkey is such a party.

The CPI was founded in the same year as our CPCGB, in 1920. In 1921 some 14 leaders of the party were dumped into the middle of the Black Sea by their enemies and left to drown. This was a devastating blow, because communist leaders cannot easily be replaced. They are not born, but made, trained, steeled in struggle over a long period. Leaders are our most valuable asset.

After its fourth congress in 1932 the Party suffered a virtual liquidation for four decades. It was brought back to life by the pressure of mass struggle during the revolutionary situation which gripped Turkey throughout the 1970s. The opportunist leadership, however, still refused to convene the fifth party congress, which was eventually held in 1984 after a sustained struggle by Leninist forces organised under the banner of *Iscinin Sesi* (*Worker's Voice*).

Launched in 1974 at the time of the London Wimpy Bar strike, *Le cinin Sesi* was the paper of the Union of Turkish Progressives, led by the CPT (England Region). In 1978, the centrist leadership balked at the prospect of carrying the revolution through to victory. It turned against the Leninist forces of the Party, effectively excommunicating them.

In response, the Leninists around *Iscinin Sesi* staged an organised and disciplined rebellion to liberate the CPT from the

opportunists. They were successful. From the fire of revolutionary struggle in the 1970s and three years of fascism a modern Bolshevik party was forged.

Part and parcel of this was undoubtedly the annual fund raising Attack. The first Attack was carried out by the CPT (England Region) in 1977. Naturally the centrist leadership, with their patronage from certain socialist states, were not too interested in the unexpected money they were sent from London. For the Leninists, though, squeezing blood from a stone had become possible.

When the leadership cut off communications with *Iscariot's Seed* in 1978, the London-based organisation found itself without patronage but with ready and willing cadres. There was a desperate need for money and no other sources than its own members, so the Summer Attack was institutionalised.

The fund raising was always combined with efforts to raise the level of political consciousness and money was raised by 'political donations' won from supporters. At the same time the value of self sacrifice and hard work in developing political consciousness and communist discipline was recognised, especially as most of the members were either unemployed or students. Some workers did extra shifts, like the Soviet subbotniks, and some took night jobs in addition to their day jobs.

The members themselves were always the backbone of the campaign: financial independence is a condition for political independence. The degree of success of the Summer Attacks became a barometer of the strength and influence of the Party. It also became an alternative 'card exchange', the occasion for those who have lost their communist conviction to pull out.

On the eve of the 1980 fascist coup, when the split between the centrist leadership and *Iscinin Sesi* was still fresh, Inanc Secic, a 20 year old *Iscinin Sesi* member in Izmir, was shot dead by the opportunists while making her way to a high school on Summer Attack fundraising work. She was carrying out open political work for *Iscinin Sesi*, and the opportunists were determined to put a stop to it. Inanc Secic was the first martyr of the Summer Attack and has provided inspiration in subsequent years.

After the coup, during the harsh years of fascist terror, the Summer Attack tradition was strengthened. Most of the fundraising was done by comrades in exile in Europe. Many comrades cut down on food in order to reach their targets. This

was the time of 'vitamin P' for potato – as some comrades survived on a diet of potatoes, a practice that was more healthy for the Party than for the individual!

In Turkey itself conditions were extremely harsh, and relatively little cash could be raised, but an effort was always made. The 1981 campaign was called the "Summer Attack Against the Fascist Junta", and helped to boost morale, draw comrades away from simply keeping their heads down and toward rallying their forces and starting to take political initiatives. It helped to raise the flag.

In last year's CPT Attack, in August and September 1988, the comrades raised in the region of £1,000 each, a very impressive total. Shortly afterwards, this performance was repeated in a six week emergency campaign, to meet particular urgent needs.

As we strive to achieve our ambitious £20,000 target in our Sixth Summer Offensive this year, we are emulating the self sacrifice of our CPT comrades. This is fully in line with our political method.

In order to carry out our task of reorganising the CPGB as a genuine revolutionary Leninist party, we draw on the most advanced lessons available to us in the world. The communist method is not to dream up new forms of struggle out of our heads, but to learn from history, from real developments. We must watch the class struggle and see what emerges. The most advanced developments must be generalised. Marx studied the Paris Commune of 1871, the first living example of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as it emerged, in order to discover its essential features and draw lessons for the next time. Lenin did the same with the soviets of 1905.

Communism is not a national affair, as some opportunists believe. We must take as our starting point the highest achievements of the working class not in Britain, but in the world. Only in this way can we hope to raise ourselves to the level necessary in order to lead the revolution in our country.

Certainly, we are striving to raise enough money to meet the immediate needs of our organisation, to produce the paper, run our central organisation and finance our various campaigns. But much more importantly, we are training ourselves. Our Summer Offensive campaigns are vital steps on the way to re forging our Communist Party, but they are even more important as training grounds for ourselves as communists.

As we undertake the most serious task of reforging our Party we will stretch ourselves well beyond what is convenient in order to do what is necessary. In doing so we become real communists who dare unite theory with practice.

In the present phase of our Offensive we have fought and won comrades to increase their pledges, which now stand at over £16,500. To bust through our £20,000 target it is vital that all supporters and readers shoulder their responsibilities and flood us with donations. Only then will we win!

Ian Farrell

Apologists

Communist Publications, Communist, June 1989, pp20, £1 (from: PO Box 3, North Shields, Tyne & Wear, NE29)

TO THE philistine our method seems divisive and our language harsh. We should stop attacking each other and unite against the Tories, they say. Yet, as history proves, such a view leads away from the struggle for revolution and to the class treachery of Labouism.

Genuine communists fight for communism, not "the next Labour government". Communist parties are not auxiliaries for Kinnock but organisations of the fighting proletariat. We will not allow ourselves to be diverted by hypocritical calls for unity or pleas for understanding because not everyone grasps the oppressive nature of the state or the fact that Britain is still an imperialist country. Those such as the Euro CPGB who have gone over to the enemy will be named and branded as traitors by us; and those centrists who try and make excuses for the Euros will receive the same treatment.

The Communist Party of Great Britain exists in name only. The Euro faction that uses the name is an agent of the bourgeoisie, used as a left cover for the most reactionary, most divisive, most defeatist ideas. Of course there is the *Morning Star's* CPB and the New Communist Party. But these organisations are equally wedded to opportunism in theory. As to practice, neither of them have done anything much beyond making pathetic calls upon the TUC to do that and the Labour Party to do the other. They are Derby and Joan retirement homes, not combat organisations of the working class.

Under these conditions communists have no choice. We must devote ourselves singlemindedly to the task of reforging the Party founded in 1920, and an integral part of this is taking on and defeating the opportunist ideas that stand in the way of this task — not only in the form of the CPB and the NCP, but also those centrist factions which continue to operate within the Euro rump. One such is the 'we're not a faction' faction around the *Reading Communist Review*; another is the Straight Leftists around *Communist*.

As far as it is concerned there is no crisis, just the forward march of history, albeit marred by a few problems, which can only be problems of growth. All they need do is stay in the Euro CPGB for as long as it takes for the recruits of *Marxism Today* to see the light. This recipe for frustration and extinction has been forced upon the Straight Leftists — once the dominant oppositionist trend within the 'official communist' movement in Britain — by their world view. A world view based on unquestioning subservience to the leadership in the USSR and any party of which it approves. Here's the problem for the Straight Leftists.

As the Euros never tire of pointing out, what Gorbachev is saying today they were saying yesterday. This leaves the Straight Leftists the problem of trying to square a circle. The Straight Leftists' *Communist* faithfully reproduces the official optimism of whichever socialist country it is discussing, all the while trying to fit this in with their position as a loyal (but illegal under rules) factional opposition within the Euro CPGB.

The difficulty of this is neatly illustrated over China. While

Communist's editor plays down the killing of demonstrators in Tiananmen Square, the Euro CPGB breaks off fraternal (and only just re-established) relations with the Communist Party of China.

The Straight Leftists know that the student demonstrators were demanding democratic rights and an end to corruption. But *Communist* tries to coax its readers into believing this is a western media lie. "The demonstrations were dubbed 'pro-democracy' by the British press, but very few political slogans seemed to emerge..."; and later we have: "... (whatever the aim of the demonstration was) ..."

The awkward fact that the students were singing the *Internationale* is omitted. Had they been clearly counterrevolutionary, *Communist* could have more easily justified the massacre. Instead, the dispatching of the students is excused by their lack of a clear platform and "ideological ignorance" (p2). Desperate for a cut and dried official line to repeat, *Communist* does its best to comfort its readers with the meagre fact which is available. "It seems ... martial law ... was gradually accepted as necessary". Well, that's a relief! "Chinese party statements now seem to suggest ..." etc.

When *Communist* finally ventures its own opinion it delivers a terrible warning for the nationalist mass movements in the Soviet Union. The Tiananmen Square massacre was evidently legitimate because: "Uncontrolled masses on the streets are a destabilising element whether under capitalism or socialism. The recent mass demonstrations by nationalists in the Soviet Union show this too." So we know what *Communist* will say when Gorbachev 'liberates' a few thousand unruly Soviet nationalists from the hardships of life!

The same 'independent thinking' is displayed by Stuart Kavanagh in his "Spotlight on New Thinking". What use is a spotlight to a blind eye? Gorbachev's absolute abandonment of proletarian internationalism and class principles are, we are told, an invention of the "western media" and "ultra-left groups" (pp5 and 6).

Nevertheless, Kavanagh quotes Gorbachev himself — straight from the horse's mouth, so to speak — at the June 1988 CPSU conference, as follows: "we have sought a deeper understanding of the interrelationship between working class interests and those of humanity as a whole ... This led us to the conclusion that common human values have a priority in our age, this being the core of the new political thinking." (my emphasis, p7)

Like a true apologist, however, Kavanagh convinces himself that the identity of human and working class interests justifies Gorbachev's ditching of the latter. "Once the word priority [Gorbachev's "core"] is discarded, the suggestion of a conflict between human and class interests disappears." It's not what they say, it's what I want them to mean.

Communist's inability to face up to the world around it is expressed pitifully in its refusal to recognise the imminent extinction of its 'party'. It reports the further decline of the Euro CPGB's workplace branches and trade union advisories — the industrial organiser is going part time — and writes of the "uncertainty about the course of the Communist Party's recovery from its crisis" (p19).

The CPGB is not recovering. It has been liquidated by the Euro faction. This will not be reversed by the crawling toadies of Straight Leftism with their disgusting apologetics for the traitor Gorbachev.

Ian Farrell

Talking shop

Reading Branch CPGB, Reading Communist Review, No3, Spring 1989, pp36, £1 (from: Reading CPGB, PO Box 160, Reading, RG5 4JF)

WHERE in their stupidity the Straight Leftists have certainty, the faction around *Reading Communist Review* is completely unsure of its ideas. It can't decide whether Marxism should be revised or ditched. Yet, in spite of its confusion, this 'we're not a faction' faction is sure on one thing ... it wants to have a meaningful relationship with the Euros.

Not for nothing did I characterise *RCR* as "political agnosticism" in my review in *The Leninist* No77. Its philosophy is perfectly in line with these politics. According to Dave Good, ex-Healyite WRP Central Committee member — whose talk on Engels' *Dialectics of Nature* to the Euro CPGB Philosophy Group is reported (uncritically) by Alan Cooper — dialectical materialism may or may not be true: "It could ... only be said that Engels had established the plausibility of dialectical materialism, not that he had validated it."

Yes, Good is a self confessed philosophical agnostic, not a Marxist! This is borne out by his reporting of a talk by Sean Sayers of the University of Kent, who does not "rule out the demise of Marxism as a possibility", but prefers the "more reasonable view" that "Marxism needs to be developed, not abandoned". (Spare us, please!)

Similarly, Will Gee, gushing with admiration for the Euros' ability to find an audience for their thoroughly bourgeois ideas, praises Robin Murray, a former GLC bureaucrat and writer in *Marxism Today*, for his flexible revisionism (if revisionism is anything it is flexible). Apparently his post-Fordist views "are at the stage of tentative exploration of a subject and not a complete theory". For comrade Gee, discussions and uncertainties are tasty, definite conclusions are unpalatable.

Jim Cook reports a Reading Euro CPGB branch discussion on Lenin's *Imperialism and What is to be done?* which led to the conclusion that "we are living in a time and place which has changed since Lenin wrote these works. For instance there is now a net transfer of capital to the imperialist countries."

We don't for an instant deny that the world has changed since Lenin's day. Change is, after all, the only constant. But what *RCR* is after is an escape clause which allows accommodation with the Euros, who consider imperialism a thing of the past. Not surprisingly the branch's meeting ended in a typical Euro style masturbatory discussion on "our ability to listen to each other"

"What caused the fragmentation of the left in Britain ...? Is Marxism a science and do communists ... have a role ...?" Jim Cook (p13) is plagued by such petty bourgeois questions and doubts. However, Cook goes no further than asking the questions. Answers are not to be found in *RCR*, only in the columns of *The Leninist*.

Whereas *The Leninist* has set itself the practical task of reforging the CPGB and sharpening its revolutionary theory in order to carry out that practice, the Reading faction have set themselves up as a talking shop within the Euro

CPGB.

What practical tasks have they set themselves? *RCR* "aims to promote an on-going discussion of Marxist philosophy, economics and sociology" and to "assist in developing the theoretical work of the party". Significantly, politics is omitted. What we are left with is theory without practice. Of course, as every Marxist knows, theory and practice are inseparable. Either revolutionary practice is moulded by revolutionary theory, or opportunist 'theory' is fashioned as an apology for the status quo and an excuse for inactivity.

Just as Dave Good (p11) complains that the Euros have adopted their "new orthodoxy" of post-Fordism without settling accounts with the "strikingly different" views discussed previously in the Euro CPGB, so *RCR* has silently dropped the term 'Marxism-Leninism', (which is still, after all, in the CPGB rules) in favour of 'Marxism', without a word of 'justification' or 'substantiation'.

RCR makes the hollow claim that it is based on the "rejection of factions" (p3), failing to recognise that what calls itself the CPGB is run by the Euro liquidationist faction which has long since turned the party into its own private property, squandering hard won resources on its factional interests and imposing bureaucratic centralism to stifle the expression of ideas not to its liking. What remains is neither communist nor a party, but a right moving Fabian sect.

Ignoring this obvious fact, pretending that they are still in a Communist Party, and therefore scorning all factions except the Euros, ensures that the Reading group can themselves be nothing other than an excuse for the Euros, a safe 'left' cover. Safe because they insist that: "Unlike others in and around the CPGB we do not intend to launch a platform."

This is a thoroughly dishonest, Trotskyite, conciliatory position, claiming no faction, no platform, and thereby concealing the fact that they are *de facto* standing against *The Leninist*, just as Trotsky supported the liquidationists against the Bolsheviks in 1912 by forming the 'non-factional' August Bloc of anti-Bolshevik groups and trends, pretending to be 'above factions'.

Comrades, you have a platform. You are following the Euro faction to the right. You have, quite rightly, dropped the claim to be 'Leninist' (but without explanation) which is more than Mikhail Gorbachev has done! Now you should come clean and drop the title 'Marxist' and 'communist'. Marxist-Leninists will join us in fighting to reforge the Communist Party of Great Britain.

Ian Farrell

ISCININ SESI BOOKS

TURKEY — WEAK LINK OF IMPERIALISM, R Yurukoglu, £2.50

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM, R Yurukoglu, £1.00

PARTY DISCIPLINE, Cemil Silahdar, £1.00

OPEN LETTER, Veli Duran, £1.00

THE THIRD PROGRAMME AND OUR TASKS, R Yurukoglu, £1.50

CONFERENCE OF THE LENINISTS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF TURKEY RESOLUTIONS 1980, £1.00

SOCIALISM WILL WIN, R Yurukoglu, £1.00

SECOND CONFERENCE OF THE LENINISTS OF THE CPT, RESOLUTIONS 1981, £1.50

THE SEPTEMBER 17 FASCIST COUP AND THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF THE CPT, £1.00

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE FUTURE, R Yurukoglu, £1.50

REFLECTIONS ON THE CANCUN CONFERENCE, R Yurukoglu, £1.00

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY, R Yurukoglu, £1.00

LIVING SOCIALISM, R Yurukoglu, £1.00

THE REVOLUTION IN AFGHANISTAN, Umar Engin, £2.00

SOLDIER ON, S Fick, £4.50

THE SITUATION AND OUR TASKS, R Yurukoglu, £1.50

DISCUSSIONS IN THE CPT, 1981-82 DOCUMENTS, £1.00

THE DISINTERGRATION OF FASCISM, R Yurukoglu, £2.50

PROGRAMME AND RULES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF TURKEY, £1.00

Send cheque or postal order to Books, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX. Add 10% p&g.

	6 months	1 year
Britain & Ireland	£5 <input type="checkbox"/>	£10 <input type="checkbox"/>
Europe	£8 <input type="checkbox"/>	£16 <input type="checkbox"/>
Rest of World	£10 <input type="checkbox"/>	£20 <input type="checkbox"/>

For more detailed rates see page two

I enclose a cheque/PO for £.... made out to November Publications

Please start my subscription with issue no....

I enclose a donation for £.... made out to November Publications

NAME

ADDRESS

Return to: Subscriptions, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX

SUBSCRIBE

Defend the rights of Bulgaria's Turks and Turkey's Kurds

TURKEY HAS in recent months seen considerable 'population movements'. Over 130,000 members of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria have crossed the border into Turkey while several thousand Kurds have fled from Turkey to Britain. For *The Leninist* these 'population movements' highlight the hypocrisy of the western press and the rank opportunism of 'official communism' in Britain and provide ample evidence of deep political problems in both Bulgaria and Turkey.

The western media has gleefully reported the mass exodus of ethnic Bulgarian Turks into Turkey. For the bourgeois pundits the sight of tens of thousands of people fleeing from 'the yoke of communism' fits neatly into a world view that sees the socialist countries as repressive living hells and the capitalist ones as havens of freedom.

While rejecting the philosophy of the bourgeois media, Leninists do not fear the truth. For us political honesty lies at the heart of our politics. Uncovering truth is central to the scientific method of Marxism-Leninism. Frankly this approach is totally alien to what is left of 'official communism' in Britain.

When it comes to these types one finds a diametrically opposed approach. Instead of searching for the truth they take the pronouncements of leaders in the socialist countries as articles of faith.

Take the New Communist Party. In its *New Worker* of the June 9 1989 it 'innocently' reported that: "Turkish propaganda campaign targets Bulgaria's muslims". In spite of itself the NCP implicitly sees the masses in the socialist countries as ripe for subversion. Apparently all the rather lumbering and unsophisticated Turkish state media has to do is broadcast a few radio programmes and those who have lived under socialism for two generations will act like pre-programmed capitalist zombies.

Such nonsense is the result of tailism. The NCP is a past master at this. In Britain it tails the Labour Party, even supporting Kinnock's purge of Militant. Internationally it tails whatever the socialist countries do. Banning Solidarnosc, legalising it, praising Brezhnev, praising Gorbachev, it does not matter to the NCP. So when it comes to Bulgaria we know what to expect. Accompanied by a large soft focus picture of Todor Zhivkov, the Bulgarian President, it practices what it knows best - diplomatic internationalism.

Along with sizable quotes from Todor Zhivkov it automatically and without explanation uses the newly defined 'official' description of the ethnic Bulgarian Turks as 'Bulgarian muslims' who were apparently forcibly converted to Islam in the 14th and 15th centuries. In repeating such untruths the *New Worker* unashamedly exposes its willingness to defend rank chauvinism; all for the sake of its aim to survive through political prostitution.

Such an attempt can only pro-

duce intellectual stupidity. Not surprisingly therefore no attempt is made to counter arguments (including Bulgarian publications up to the early 1980s) that Bulgaria's muslims are in fact ethnic Bulgarian Turks. Transparently the £150pw hacks who staff the *New Worker* are only the collaters of articles released by the press agencies and international departments of the ruling Communist Parties in the socialist countries.

But even these types know damn well that the description 'Bulgarian muslims' is a total fabrication, a subjective whim of the Bulgarian leadership bent on proving Brecht wrong: the government can change the people. The aim is to produce a homogeneous population through the crudest of bureaucratic methods.

They failed. The facts speak for themselves in the form of the Bulgarian citizens who are presently streaming across the border into Turkey at the rate of 2,000 a day. These people are the human product of bureaucratic chauvinism which, since 1984, decided that the language of Bulgarian Turks was effectively banned, their mosques had to be closed and Turkish surnames and forenames dropped along with other aspects of their cultural identity in a crude drive to 'Bulgarianise' them.

Anyone - like myself - who has spent any time in Bulgaria will know that Bulgarian workers refer to 'Zhivkov's muslims' as Turks. Anyone who travelled across Bulgaria and has any understanding of Bulgarian and Turkish know that 'Zhivkov's muslims' speak Turkish as their mother tongue.

Let the 'official communists' deny it and, having done so, let them tell us who it was who said in 1964 that: "The children of the Turkish population must learn their mother tongue and perfect it." Who was it who said that: "It is necessary that the teaching of the Turkish language be improved in schools." And who was it who stated that: "Now and in the future the Turkish population will speak their mother tongue; they will write their contemporary literary work; they will sing their wonderful songs." No need to send your answers in on the back of a postcard: the source was of course Todor Zhivkov!

For the opportunists of the NCP political prostitution may ensure, at least in the short term, that the *New Worker* comes out on time every week. But what is far more certain is that the dishonesty of its politics will ensure that the content of the paper's prelates less and less to the real world, like the turgid dogma of the smallest Trotskyoid sects.

As is well known the NCP are not the only political prostitutes to emanate from 'official communism' in Britain. The *Morning Star* has also gone for this option. It has been at pains to limit the coverage of the exodus of Bulgarian Turks to small one paragraph snippets. Given the propaganda barrage coming from the Ozal government in Turkey and the western media in general this is

woefully inadequate.

We are not demanding that the *Morning Star* prints lengthy excerpts from Bulgarian press handouts, rather than small ones. When the leadership of a socialist country engages in what can only be described as a chauvinist programme, firstly of attempted forced assimilation and then, failing that, national 'purification' through the removal of Turks from Bulgarian soil, it should provoke the most searching examination of the politics and policies by all those who call themselves communists. The unwillingness or inability of the 'official communists' to do this is eloquent testimony to their bankruptcy.

How do Leninists view developments in Bulgaria?

The heightened tensions inside Bulgaria between the state and the ethnic Bulgarian Turks is yet another manifestation of the deepening crisis of bureaucratic socialism. The increasingly vocal demands of ethnic Bulgarian Turks for basic democratic rights produced panic in the upper echelons of the party. Where Gorbachev has come up with the sop of glasnost, the leaders in Bulgaria fear that any such move in their country might precipitate a political 'meltdown'.

For the bureaucracy the struggle of the ethnic Bulgarian Turks to win their demands for greater rights actually provides the rest of the Bulgarian working class with an unwanted example. Fearing that unrest could spread it decided to crush Turkish protests regardless of the cost in human lives (60 died). As this provoked stubborn resistance and a turn to the bigotry of Islam, the Bulgarian leadership has resorted to the crudest forms of national chauvinism in order to remove the problem. For Leninists, the behaviour of the 'official communists' in Bulgaria is to be deplored. It has nothing to do with genuine communism.

In the last two years of his life Lenin waged a bitter fight against Great Russian chauvinism. During the discussions in the early 1920s over the formation of the Soviet Union and its constitution, Lenin polemised sharply against Stalin - a Georgian - and his idea of a Greater Russian state. Lenin argued for, and won, a federal union of equal Georgian, Ukrainian, Russian, Uzbek etc republics. Their unity, Lenin insisted, had to be voluntary and could only be secured by constitutionally institutionalising the national rights of all the peoples of the Soviet Union in separate national republics and autonomous republics and regions - including the "right to freely secede" (article 72 of Soviet Constitution).

It is obvious that the Bulgarian leadership no longer even pays lip service to the Leninist nationalities policy. They openly advocate chauvinism. They have, through their policies, encouraged the Turkish minority into the open arms of Islam and the Turkish state. In doing so the strength and standing of socialism in Bulgaria is

undermined. No communist worthy of the name can defend this.

Having dealt with the Bulgarian leadership, how should Leninists assess the Turkish regime's position?

It has made great play on its stated willingness to accept the possible 250,000 refugees that Bulgarian sources suggest could flee if the exodus is left 'unchecked'. It is important that the foreign policy intentions of the Turkish regime are seen as a direct extension of domestic policy. The Turkish regime is faced with very serious domestic problems of its own, with the rising tide of working class struggle unleashed by the victory of the Netas strike early in 1987.

The Turkish regime has been reeling from the after effects of this year's May Day march in the capital Istanbul, which brought tens of thousands of workers on to the streets to defy the state ban. The Turkish bourgeoisie is once again haunted by the spectre of the working class of Turkey.

It is in this light that Leninists view the 'caginess' of the Turkish regime to accommodate the tens of thousands of ethnic Bulgarian Turks. For domestic consumption, Ozal's photocalls on the border of Bulgaria welcoming the refugees to the 'motherland' provides a heaven sent opportunity to deflect from domestic problems by pointing to a 'common enemy', the Bulgarians.

Over the past month huge chauvinist demonstrations have been staged in the streets of Istanbul calling for revenge against the Bulgarians. Fuelled by stories in the Turkish and western press of children being vaccinated with infectious diseases before being granted permission to leave Bulgaria, the Ozal regime has been able to paint itself the champion of freedom and liberty.

On another level the mass exodus provides the Turkish regime with ammunition to tackle other domestic problems. The Turkish regime is attempting to use the ethnic Bulgarian Turks as pawns. The victims of the Bulgarianisation programmes are being used in the Turkishisation programme directed against the Kurdish people in Turkey and in the occupied territories of Northern Cyprus. Through resettlement programmes the Turkish regime hopes to alter the balance of ethnic forces in these territories. Revealingly, the left of centre Turkish magazine *Towards 2000* was banned when it compared the treatment of Turks in Bulgaria to that of the Kurds by Turkey. We can have no sympathy with the Turkish regime.

Returning to Bulgaria: it is becoming blatantly obvious that the Bulgarianisation programme has backfired on those who launched it. According to our reports, because of the labour shortage caused by the departure of thousands of Turks, teachers and office workers are being organised into brigades to ensure that this year's harvest is gathered in. In other sectors of the economy we are told that student brigades are being directed into villages where factories are nearly at a standstill after

whole workforces downed tools and collected up their belongings to head for Turkey. In the short term the factories may be kept open, but what happens in September when the students return to college and many more tens of thousands of ethnic Bulgarian Turks head for Turkey?

Bulgaria already faces serious labour shortages in certain sectors and Bulgarian productive capacity is expected to be badly hit by the mass exodus. Given the present shortages of basic necessities in shops and the queues which are very much part of everyday life in Bulgaria, greater mass pressure will be placed on the authorities if the economy continues to deteriorate.

The situation in Turkey is similar, if for very different reasons. While not attempting to be an advice bureau to the Turkish bourgeoisie it is important to also assess the likely impact of the Bulgarian Turks. As several astute bourgeois journalists have noted, although Turkey is publicly committed to taking the 1.5 million ethnic Bulgarian Turks from Bulgaria, there are private hopes within the regime that the exodus will stop.

With mass unemployment and underemployment, the regime will be hard pushed to accommodate the large numbers of refugees expected. So although the Turkish bourgeoisie can hope to make a lot of political capital out of the exodus in the short term, the longer term outlook for it is bleak.

The 'Bulgarian factor' will have an effect on the class struggle in Turkey, as the bourgeoisie is temporarily able to railroad backward sections of the working class in Turkey into identifying with the regime against the Bulgarian state. Yet the fact that the government has done everything to mobilise the masses on to the streets - albeit on the basis of reactionary slogans - in fact testifies to the instability of Turkey. Capitalist governments prefer to keep the masses passive.

Because of the deepening contradictions of Turkish monopoly capital and the impasse that it faces in expanding its world horizons, its inability to become imperialist, attention will be brought back to domestic problems sooner rather than later. The Turkish bourgeoisie will pay a high price for having brought into the political arena passive and backward layers of the masses.

For Leninists it is important to make a stand with the ethnic Bulgarian Turks against the chauvinism of the Bulgarian state and Communist Party. As Lenin argued persistently in the last two years of his life, chauvinism under socialism must be fought and the cultural and democratic rights of national minorities must be secured. This is vital if the struggle for communism is to advance.

In taking this stand we line up with the revolutionary forces of Turkey, including the Kurdish people whom the Turkish regime denies the right to self-determination.

Charles Anderson

Unemployed ——— **ORGANISER**

Paper of the Unemployed Workers Charter

Smash Slave Labour!

- UWC march on the TUC. Send off to marchers, Friday September 1. Albert Square, in front of Manchester Town Hall, 12 noon.
- Send off concert for London lobbyists: Sunday, September 3. Red Rose Club, 129 Seven Sisters Road, London N7. With music, comedy, poetry and theatre. Nearest tube — Finsbury Park.



CORRECTION
DATE OF MANCHESTER SEND OFF
CHANGED TO 12.00 ON 11.09.01

- Lobby the TUC/Welcome UWC marchers. Monday, September 4. Winter Gardens, Blackpool. From 8am to 11.30am.
- UWC Fringe meeting. Monday, September 4. Claremont Hotel, 270 North Promenade, Blackpool. 12 noon.

UWC

BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX. Tel: 01-431 3135

September 4: Lobby the TUC!

The Unemployed Workers Charter is organising a mass lobby of the TUC on September 4. We will be demanding something we should not have to demand: that the TUC ends its disgraceful collaboration with the Tories cheap labour con job, Employment Training.

Every report that the UWC receives from around the country confirms what we have said about this so-called 'training' scheme. It is a slap dash, cynical slave labour scheme.

It ruthlessly exploits the labour of the 'trainees'. It gives them hopeless standards of 'training'. The scheme is used to undercut the wages and conditions of employed workers. The thing is a flop - currently in London there are more people actually leaving the scheme than joining it.

Given all of this, why on earth is the TUC backing ET? Because the official leadership of the workers' movement have adopted policies which are not that much different from Thatcher in their search for electoral 'respectability' and success.

The TUC, along with the leadership of the Labour Party, tell us that to campaign against ET is to 'turn your back on the unemployed'.

Instead of fighting for what we as unemployed workers need to lead decent lives - work or full maintenance, high quality training at trade union rates - the likes of Willis tell us that we must be satisfied with what the bosses' system can afford to push our way.

What good is this to workers? We need jobs. We need decent training facilities. We need benefits which allow us to lead full lives. And if our so-called leaders are unable or unwilling to fight for this, then we'll organise ourselves.

This year the UWC will again be lobbying the TUC (see 'Battle Plan' for details). We organise this protest not in order to pass the buck as others do. We have no illusions in the militancy of Willis, Todd, Ellis and the rest. They are traitors to the working class, useless to workers in struggle.

We lobby the TUC because of what it represents. The achievement of a united centre for the workers' movement in Britain was a major step forward for our class.

Can you imagine how powerful our movement would be, the totally transformed position of the unemployed, if the TUC were run by class war generals?

By people at least as determined and single minded as Thatcher?

We will lobby the TUC demanding they take up the fight against ET - or if they are incapable of that fight then make way for those who are able.

And the UWC does not just leave it there. We don't just leave the demand hanging in mid-air.

We organise to fight ET in the here and now.

We picket, lobby, march, organise ETers on schemes, fight Restart/availability for work and other harassment of the unemployed, organise claimants on the dole queues, support workers in dispute - every day the UWC is fighting to build the mass fighting unemployed movement that our class needs.

We need you to join that fight. If you are not a supporter of the UWC, join us! If there isn't a branch in your area, then contact us and we'll help you to set one up! Get active - there's lots to be done!

ET: THE FIGHTBACK BUILDS UP BATTLE PLAN FOR MARCH ON TUC

•UWC march on the TUC. Send off to marchers, Thursday August 31, Albert Square, in front off Manchester Town Hall, 6.30pm. The Manchester branch of the UWC are taking on the bulk of organisation for this. The branch includes, Jack Cummings, a veteran from the National Unemployed Workers Movement of the 1920s/30. The NUWM organised many such marches. This is our first, but it most certainly won't be our last!

•This year we are going to combine the arrival of our March on the TUC with the biggest UWC lobby of the TUC so far. We want to get hundreds and hundreds of unemployed and employed workers, 'trainees' and UWC supporters laying siege to the Winter Gardens in Blackpool. Give the smug bureaucrats of the TUC the



message - 'Either fight for our rights, or get out of the way for those who will!'

•Send off concert for London lobbyists: Sunday, September 3, Red Rose Club, 129 Seven Sisters

Road, London N7. With music, comedy, poetry and theatre. Nearest tube - Finsbury Park. Coaches will leave from this concert at 12 midnight and travel over night to Blackpool.

•Lobby the TUC/Welcome UWC marchers. Monday, September 4, Winter Gardens, Blackpool. From 8am to 11.30am. The lobbyists from London will arrive in time to welcome the UWC marchers. Together they will then make sure the delegates to the TUC get the message!

•UWC Fringe meeting. Monday, September 4, Claremont Hotel, 270 North Promenade, Blackpool. 12 noon. We will finish the day off with a meeting to review the fightback against cheap labour - what we have achieved and what needs to be done.

JUNE 15

A STEP FORWARD



•June 15 - a real step forward

AROUND 150 people marched through the streets of London on June 15 against Employment Training. In different parts of the country on the same day, hundreds of activists took part in marches, strikes, occupations and pickets. June 15 was a real step forward in the fight to build a national unemployed workers movement and a fighting unity between the employed and the unemployed.

The UWC took the lead in London in fighting to make June 15 a genuine day of action. In contrast to the tame 'protests' organised by the likes of the TUC, to join us on

June 15, workers had to go on strike. This made the fight to build June 15 as a manifestation of the unity between the fights of the unemployed and employed hard. But hard or not, it was a correct approach and one which will pay enormous dividends in the future.

The UWC went to union branches, student branches (see reports) and campaigning organisations like the City Anti-Apartheid Group. We won support for the action from many sources. We covered doles queues, homeless centres and held public meetings to build for June 15.

Leading UWC activists spoke at

literally dozens of union and other meetings winning support. Altogether, we distributed nearly 40,000 individual pieces of literature for the strike and march. The message of the UWC 'touched' literally thousands of workers, unemployed and employed. The UWC has never worked to such a level and we have come out of the end of the campaign with a greater number of high quality contacts than ever before.

•There were undoubtedly weaknesses with the campaign, however. Numbers on the day were lower than we would want. This reflects the fact that although we are winning a lot of sympathy, we need to translate that feeling into active commitment.

•In terms of the literature we were able to put out, there was a gap. We certainly needed another issue of *Unemployed Organiser* out but were derailed by lack of finances which we could not get around.

Despite this, June 15 was a vital staging post in our campaign. All around the country, hundreds of marchers and picketers, and behind them thousands of workers, were starting to make a stand on this vital question. That is a major achievement in itself. And it is only the beginning.

Last year, the UWC organised the largest lobby of the TUC since the end of the miners' Great Strike. This year, we are aiming even higher. Make sure you are there!

MANCHESTER

Manchester UWC has started to make its mark. A tribute to the work of our comrades came recently from an unexpected source. The Manchester City Area Employment Service wrote to them suggesting cooperation in setting up an "Employment Service Users Group" and also in the preparations for a new Job Centre in the Cheetham Hill area of Manchester.

Jack Cummings of Manchester UWC commented that "it was obvious at the meeting that the department are terrified at the

support for the action on June 15, support we regard as invaluable and for which we would like to thank them:

- London West DE
- Inner London West DE
- Inner London East DE
- South East London DE
- Westminster DoE
- London South DE

On Monday June 26, some 41 offices in London were involved in action of various kinds - including walkouts and strikes - against management attempts to introduce ET into the service. The UWC pledges its support for the action of Civil Servants and will aid the fightback in any way possible.

dent of the University of London, despite the bad timing as far as exams were concerned. We plan to build on these important links for the future.

AND ON AND ON

The saga of the UWC's petition to the TUC demanding it withdraws its cooperation from ET goes on and on. Readers will remember that, originally, we tried to present the petition, then 10,000 signatures strong, at the UWC's lobby of the TUC conference in Bournemouth last year - the largest lobby since the end of the miners' strike. The TUC refused to even accept the petition from our rep on that occasion, referring him instead to the end of huge 'Enquiries' queue!

We refused to take this insult lying down. Our Honorary President, the late Jack Dash, wrote a letter of complaint to Norman Willis. The reply explained that as the UWC - the campaigning voice of the unemployed - had "no standing in relation to congress business" (!) it was therefore correct to ignore us. Our new national petition - supporting the demands of our Charter - is now creeping towards our 20,000 target. We wrote to the TUC asking for a representative to accept the petition from the June 15 demonstration - and a day before the demo, they wrote a terse note back telling us it would not be "possible". We need to build the UWC to ensure that the 'leaders' of the workers' movement cannot ignore the unemployed and hoping we go quietly away!

SS BILL

The Social Security Bill will impose on the unemployed new obligations to "actively seek work" and to *prove* it. While claimants are under the lash, the Bill does not impose any obligations on the bosses to employ more unemployed people or even acknowledge job applications. Thus, even gathering the evidence that you *have* been busy applying for jobs all week may be hard enough. This 'active' clause is yet another attack on the right of the unemployed to claim benefit and another step towards compulsory work for dole. The government plans to harass hundreds of thousands more claimants off the dole into useless 'training schemes' or low paid, insecure work. The UWC will fight these attacks through mass protests and actions, just as the National Unemployed Workers Movement fought the similar "genuinely seeking work" clause in the 1930s.

MIGRANT LABOUR

The Tories have stepped up their attacks on migrant workers in this country. In a series of swoops earlier this year, police and Home Office officials netted hundreds of 'illegal' Turkish workers in East London sweatshops. The UWC says that the product of workers' labour is not illegal, so *no worker is 'illegal'*. We demand full citizen rights for workers, including the right to vote and settle permanently in Britain if that is their wish. ET and other cheap labour schemes threaten migrant workers particularly, given their already precarious position in the labour market and their status as casualised cheap labour. Rightly, there-

fore, the Union of Turkish Workers and the East London Textiles branch of the T&G - overwhelmingly composed of workers from Turkey - both pledged their support for June 15 and turned out banners and marchers!

CUTS

From May 22, all recruits to ET will only get the flat rate £10 a week 'top up' on their dole. The additions of £11.25 (married claimant without children) and £11.95 (single person aged under 25) are to be abolished. The Tories are making cuts in the already pathetic levels of 'training allowance' under ET - how long before they drop the pretence altogether and move towards compulsory work for dole?

FROZEN

The training allowance for young 'trainees' has been frozen for the second successive year. These young workers get the pittance of £29.50 (first year), then £35 a week (second year). Remember how, when the training allowance for young 'trainees' was introduced with YOP in 1978, the weekly allowance of £19.50 was rightly condemned as "cheap labour"? Well, in relative terms, the current allowance is almost *half* its 1978 value! We mustn't let them get away with it!



WOULD-BE ET

UWC sympathisers in West London CPSA have told us an amusing tale. Two ETers were scheduled to be introduced into Finchley UBO and Job Centre in June. One of these supposed 'trainees' was actually a middle aged woman with extensive experience in the Canadian civil service - not exactly someone who would need that much 'training' in the work of most lower grade civil servants. Anyway, CPSA activists managed to speak to the two before they took up their places. The would-be ETers were under the impression that they would have guaranteed jobs at the end of their 'training'. When informed that this was not true, they both blew out of ET... even before their courses had started! Another triumph for the government's new 'training' scheme.

P&O STRIKERS

The rally at the end of the June 15 march against ET in London was addressed by Becky Sawbridge and Jack Williamson, representatives of the heroic P&O strikers. The rank and file seafarers are now fighting a rearguard action against

the sellout of their dispute by their union (mis)leadership. The national action was called off just as solidarity was beginning to bite. This left the 2,000 P&O workers in Dover isolated.

The workers fought on, despite the fact that the leaders of their own union obviously regarded the strike as an embarrassment to be quietly forgotten about. The UWC pays tribute to the tenacious fight of the P&O strikers and we were honoured by their presence on the June 15 march in London. Clearly, the fights of the unemployed and workers in dispute are intimately linked.

• Because the P&O strikers have been betrayed by the yellow leadership of the workers' movement in much the same way as the unemployed. Both have been ignored and left to face the attacks of the bosses alone.

• Because the P&O management used inexperienced scab labour to help defeat the strikers. Much of that scab labour had been recruited from the local dole queues. Unless they are organised by a militant organisation like the scab proof UWC, the unemployed will be used precisely in this way. In fact, there are rumours that ETers are now to be introduced onto Jeffrey Sterling's Sealink, the company that sequestered the union's funds... and which the NUS tops like McCluskie promoted as an 'alternative' to P&O!

We need unity between the employed and unemployed to defeat the bosses' attacks. That is one of the basic lessons from the fight of the P&O strikers.

HOMELESS

The Housing Benefit cuts imposed by the Tories have forced more and more people - particularly young people - onto the streets. From April of this year, the attacks were stepped up. Now Income Support claimants in board and lodging will no longer be able to get an additional allowance to help pay extra costs, such as for meals, heating and cleaning. They now get only standard rate Income Support and Housing Benefit for the rent element of what they pay. And of course, the 'local upper limit' on Housing Benefit may be set below this rate anyway. The effect will be to dump even more on the streets. These people desperately need organisation to fight these attacks. The UWC will fight the scourge of homelessness with occupations and militant action. A decent home for all! No ifs, no buts - Organise to fight the cuts!

MOODIE

On Tuesday May 9, strike action in London DSS offices met the imposition of the Moodie/relocation attack on civil servants. The Tories are planning to 'relocate' over 1,000 jobs from London to regional centres such as Belfast, Wigan and Glasgow. Information on claimants will be collated in these centres and the whole system is linked with a new £37 million computer network. So far the scheme is limited to London, but these regional centres have the capacity (in theory) to handle claimant information from other areas. The unemployed must stand with the DSS workers fighting these attacks. The system is in a hopeless mess as it is: processing London claims in Glasgow is unlikely to make it any more efficient!



prospect of the unemployed becoming organised. Hence the attempt to draw our teeth by this offer of cooperation."

Manchester UWC have made it plain that any form of cooperation will depend on the following conditions being adhered to:

- No vacancies to be advertised in the Job Centre below an agreed minimum wage (£160 a week).
- No jobs to be advertised unless they carry with them trade union rates of pay and conditions.
- No vacancies to be advertised at a place of work where the workers are in dispute.
- No compulsion or undue pressure to accept training schemes.
- The right of all 'users of the employment service' to be represented by a UWC member when attending Restart interviews, etc.
- The UWC to be consulted by the Department of Employment on all initiatives that affect the unemployed or "trainees".

UWC MARCH ON THE TUC, MANCHESTER TO BLACKPOOL. SEE THE MARCHERS OFF - THURSDAY AUGUST 31. ALBERT SQUARE, IN FRONT OF MANCHESTER TOWN HALL, 6.30PM.

CPSA

In the course of building for the strike action and march on June 15, the UWC in London has worked in close contact with activists in the union for lower paid civil servants - the CPSA. This is an enormously important development. Often the only way claimants and workers in the UBOs and DSS offices encounter each other is through a glass screen, in a situation which is bound to lead to antagonism. This type of division is fostered and encouraged by the bosses. When civil servants go on strike to defend pay and conditions, the media of the ruling class makes great play of the 'suffering' of the unemployed, in order to stir up divisions and antagonism to the strikers. The UWC fought for support from civil servants for the June 15 action. We argued that this was vital as ET and all cheap labour schemes were fundamental attacks on the rights and living standards of all workers, not just the unemployed. The following London CPSA branches pledged

DOCKERS

The government has announced plans to abolish the Dock Labour Scheme - the systhat embodies the dockers' right to work, won as a result of decades of hard class battles. The UWC has already organised a very successful solidarity meeting with the dockers, addressed by stewards from Tilbury. Also, the Workers Theatre Movement have not only performed a sketch on the dock's struggle in the meeting, which went down brilliantly, but also travelled with dockers and UWCers down to the TGWU conference in Brighton on June 26. There we joined the dockers' lobby of the conference and the WTM performed the sketch again... to rapturous applause and requests for them to travel to perform for dockers in Liverpool and other places. The UWC pledges its continued support to the dockers in their fight to defend their right to work - the fight that unites all workers.

LOANS

The UWC has fought to build the links between the unemployed and students. The Tories are planning to replace the current grant system with loans - students would have to 'borrow' the money to see them through college and then pay it back at the end of their courses. This would obviously have the effect of forcing working class youth out of higher education. Along with con jobs like ET, these attacks clearly illustrate what Tory policies are about: as our leaflet to students stated "these cheap labour schemes are intimately linked to the Tories' proposed attacks on working class students. The ruling class are out to create a passive, under educated working class, non-unionised and prepared to work for slave labour rates!" We have received support and interest from students and student unions from the following colleges: South Thames College, London College of Fashion, ULU, Middlesex Poly, London College of Printing and Digby Stuart College. A number of students attended the June 15 march, including the Vice presi-

OBITUARY

JACK DASH: OUTSTANDING LEADER

Jack Dash died at the age of 83 at the London Hospital, Whitechapel on Thursday June 8. We were always very proud to have had Jack as our Honorary President. Jack was an outstanding rank and file dockers' leader, veteran of the National Unemployed Workers Movement and a principled communist. His life stands as an inspiration for all who fight for the liberation of mankind from the shackles of capitalism



● Jack Dash: Outstanding class fighter

For Jack the dawning of political consciousness was the General Strike of 1926. He remembers seeing troops sent into London to protect scab lorries. But it was the experience of unemployment that proved to be the key. In his recently reprinted autobiography, *Good Morning Brothers!* he describes how he first came across the UWC of its day, the National Unemployed Workers Movement. "During my spells of unemploy-

ment, I had found time to do some reading and political study. I joined the Labour Party, but I did not remain a member for long. One day, after signing on at the Walworth Road Labour Exchange, I found that the National Unemployed Workers Movement was holding a meeting. I stopped to listen. The speaker was a powerfully built chap with a rugged countenance and a stentorian voice. He was explaining the reason for the

mass unemployment and the need to get organised to demand an end to the Means Test and the closing down of the work camps - Belmont in particular. That was the place where you could be directed when you had exhausted your twenty six weeks' miserable unemployment benefit; you made an application for relief and then were directed to this labour camp while your dependants were issued with food.

"The speaker went on to explain why there should be liaison between the Unemployed Workers Movement and the trade unions. Each was dependent on the other, he said. If there was no political understanding, the unemployed would always be used as cheap labour as a constant threat to those in work, while we, the unemployed, needed the strength of the trade union movement to pressure the government into removing the Means Test and providing adequate maintenance and increased benefits.

"All this made good sense to me, and when the speaker had finished his talk and answered questions from the crowd and the chairman had appealed for a collection and closed the meeting, I stayed behind. I was deeply impressed by all that had been said and wanted to continue the discussion with the speaker. Arising out of our conversation I learned he was a casual dock worker and his name was Patsy Hicks. We became friends, and as a result of many keen and heated discussions we had together, and the reading of some of the books he recommended, I began to do some political rethinking."

Jack went on to join the NUWM

and then, with the upturn in the economy at the beginning of World War II, he managed to get himself into the docks. It was here as a rank and file dockers leader that he rose to national prominence. The bosses media grew to hate him as the personification of militancy and working class confidence.

After he retired from the docks in 1970 Jack did not let up on his political activities. He spoke at countless meetings, hammering away at the necessity for working class organisation and socialism. When the UWC was formed he gladly accepted our invitation to become its Honorary President. In spite of opposition from some circles, he was proud to be associated with us and our cause.

Just before he was admitted into hospital he insisted - in spite of doctor's advice - on speaking to our UWC meeting in central London to mobilise for the June 15 action. All the passion and fire was still there. He urged the UWC to continue the struggle of the "pioneers of our great movement" for a socialist Britain where the people will be the rightful owners of the land and the means of production and for the dignity of every single being."

UWC members joined militant dockers in the march to Jack's funeral in London's East End and our statement commemorating his work with the unemployed was warmly received by his family, former comrades and workmates. Fittingly at the end of the June 15 London demonstration a minutes silence was observed for Jack Dash. We salute the life of Jack Dash. We rededicate ourselves to the fight for human dignity.

UWC

THE UNEMPLOYED WORKERS CHARTER

BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX. Tel: 01-431 3135

The Unemployed Workers Charter says:

- Work at trade union rates or full maintenance for the unemployed at the average level of pay.
- Smash ET and YTS - for real training at trade union rates.
- Stop harassment of the unemployed. Claiming benefit is a right not a crime.
- End all unnecessary overtime work with no loss of pay.
- Unemployed workers groups should have representation on trades councils and the TUC. A national unemployed workers' movement is needed to be the voice of the unemployed.
- ET 'trainees' - Off the dole and into your union! The UWC is organising 'trainees' on these schemes to join the TGWU. This will enable us to build fighting unity between employed and unemployed workers. Write to the UWC and we will put you in touch with your local branch.

JOIN UP!

The Unemployed Workers Charter is a militant campaigning organisation. It is open to both unemployed and employed workers - united we will build the national unemployed workers' movement that our class needs. We need you, so don't just sit there - join up! Get involved in your local branch. If there isn't one, then set one up. Take bulk copies of *Unemployed Organiser* and spread the word. Get organised!

I would like to become a UWC supporter ☐

I would like to set up a UWC branch ☐

Please send me ... copies of *Unemployed Organiser* (bulk rates for 5 or more copies: 5p each)

Name

Address

Tel